

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

IP INNOVATION L.L.C. AND	§	
TECHNOLOGY LICENSING CORPORATION,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	CASE NO. 2:07CV-503-RRR
v.	§	
	§	JURY TRIAL REQUESTED
GOOGLE INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

**IP INNOVATION’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE
ORDER PURSUANT TO FED.R.CIV.P. 26(c)**

As Google correctly notes, any attempt to block the taking of the Smith deposition is now effectively moot, as Google conducted the deposition on January 15th. Likewise, Google is correct that the timely objections raised by IP Innovation’s motion could be dealt with as one of the upcoming motions in limine, the deadline for which is several weeks away.

The Plaintiffs, however, were compelled to preserve their objections to the untimeliness of Google’s deposition, given that: 1) Google did not identify who Mr. Smith was, or why his deposition was being taken until January 8, 2010; 2) Google had not included Mr. Smith on its list of witnesses, nor had Google included him amongst the 50 witnesses which it had identified only last month in their supplemental initial disclosure; and 3) because of the coincident date of expert supplemental reports on January 15th, Plaintiffs were not able to attend the deposition in person.

IP Innovation, however, believes that such a motion should be unnecessary, as Plaintiffs – prior to filing their motion – indicated their willingness to stipulate to the authenticity of

Google's web page as part of a larger compromise about the authenticity and admissibility of other exhibits that each side would likely rely upon at trial. IP Innovation is generally averse to filing such motions, except in cases such as the present motion to compel which was necessary to preserve their objections due to when the deposition was noticed and scheduled. Despite the present motion, however, the Plaintiffs are still amenable to reaching a compromise to agree to the admissibility and authenticity of such an exhibit.

Thus, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 (c) and 32(a)(5)(A), Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court bar Google's use of such testimony against the Plaintiffs.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Paul C. Gibbons

Raymond P. Niro

Joseph N. Hosteny

Arthur A. Gasey

Paul C. Gibbons

Douglas M. Hall

David J. Mahalek

NIRO, SCAVONE, HALLER & NIRO

181 West Madison, Suite 4600

Chicago, Illinois 60602

Telephone: (312) 236-0733

Facsimile: (312) 236-3137

T. John Ward

Jack Wesley Hill

Ward & Smith

111 W. Tyler St.

Longview, Texas 75601

Telephone: (903) 757-6400

Toll Free (866) 305-6400

Facsimile: (903) 757-2323

ATTORNEYS FOR IP INNOVATION L.L.C. and
TECHNOLOGY LICENSING CORPORATION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing **IP INNOVATION'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER PURSUANT TO FED.R.CIV.P. 26(c)** was filed with the Clerk of the Court on January 20, 2010 using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following at their email address on file with the Court.

David J. Beck
Texas Bar No. 00000070
dbeck@brsfinn.com
Michael E. Richardson
Texas Bar No. 24002838
mrichardson@brsfirm.com
BECK, REDDEN & SECREST, L.L.P. One
Houston Center
1221 McKinney St., Suite 4500 Houston,
Texas 77010
(713) 951-3700
(713) 951-3720 (Fax)

Mark G. Matuschak
mark.matuschak@wilmerhale.com
Richard A. Goldenberg
Richard.goldenberg@wilmerhale.com
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 526-6000
(617) 526-5000 (Fax)

John H. Hintz
John.hintz@wilmerhale.com
Victor F. Souto
Victor.souto@wilmerhale.com
Ross E. Firsenbaum
Ross.firsenbaum@wilmerhale.com
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP
399 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 230-8800
(212) 230-8888 (Fax)

Elizabeth I. Rogers
Elizabeth.brannen@wilmerhale.com
Anna T. Lee
Anna.lee@wilmerhale.com
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP
1117 California Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304
(650) 858-6042
(650) 858-6100 (Fax)

/s/ Paul C. Gibbons
